

**REMARKS**

The Office Action in the above-identified application has been carefully considered and this amendment has been presented to place this application in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, reexamination and reconsideration of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, and 32 are in the present application. It is submitted that these claims were patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. The changes to the claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. sections 101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled. Claims 13-21 and 34-42 are canceled.

The Examiner contends the application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure. However, the Abstract was submitted on separately numbered sheet 103; a copy of which is enclosed herewith. Accordingly, Applicants believe this objection shown be withdrawn.

The title of the invention was objected to as not being descriptive. In response, Applicants have replaced the title to be clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Accordingly, Applicants believe this objection has been overcome.

Claims 19-21 and 40-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Takiguchi et. al. (EP Patent Application 0 717 346 A2). In response, the rejected claims have been canceled. Accordingly, Applicants believe this rejection is moot.

Claims 13-14, 17, 34-35, and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Matthews et. al. (U.S. Patent 5,677,708). In response, the rejected claims have been canceled. Accordingly, Applicants believe this rejection is moot.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takiguchi in view of Baker (U.S. Patent 6,002,401).

The present invention “gradually enlarges the selected icon on the transit screen, to zoom in on the icon, and gradually fades display of the selected icon on the transit screen to switch this display to display of the information screen.” (Claim 1; Claims 3, 7, 9, 22, 24, 28, and 30 contain similar limitations) As shown in Figure 6, the present invention displays icons (information screens) on a menu screen for selection. The information screens are organized in a hierarchy of linked layers with the lowest layer being an actual program for display. (Figure 6) When the user selects an icon from the menu screen, the icon becomes a transit screen which is enlarged and faded to reveal the next layer of icons. (Figures 8(A)-8(C))

The Examiner contends Takiguchi discloses a transit screen as recited in the present claims. (Office Action pages 8-9) However, as shown in Figure 60, Takiguchi actually discloses simultaneously displaying a hierarchy of icon levels rather than using a transit screen to switch between the display of linked layers as in the present invention. Further, although Takiguchi uses the term “zoom-in,” Applicants believe this simply refers to changing the display size of the

icons in a layer in a discrete step, rather than a gradual enlargement as recited in the present invention.

The Examiner further asserts Baker's disclosure of fading an icon meets the present invention's "gradually fad[ing] display of the selected icon on the transit screen to switch this display to display of the information screen." However, the present invention specifically recites "gradually" fading which is not taught in Baker.

Moreover, the present invention uses the transit screen to switch the display to the information screen corresponding to the next layer, which not taught by Baker or Takiguchi. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Baker and Takiguchi fail to obviate the present invention and the rejected claims should be allowed.


Claims 15-16, 18, 36-37, and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takiguchi in view of Matthews. In response, the rejected claims have been canceled. Accordingly, Applicants believe this rejection is moot.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application as now presented is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

No additional fees are deemed to be required for the filing of this amendment, but if such are, the Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions, he/she is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number provided below. The Examiner's consideration of this matter is gratefully acknowledged.

Respectfully submitted,  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:   
Darren M. Simon  
Reg. No. 47,946  
(212) 588-0800